DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 327 HE 011 629

AUTHOR Brodzinski, Frederick R.
TITLE The Future of Student Services: Parameters, Resources, and Consumer Interests.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ancillary Services; Change Strategies; College Administration; *College Students; Educational Change; Educational Economics; Enrollment Trends; Financial Problems; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Program Administration; Resource Allocations; Retrenchment; *Special Services; *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

Trends and developments that will have an impact on the future of student services and higher education are discussed. The importance of the student services sector in the total higher education enterprise is emphasized. It is suggested that planning and sensitivity to development within the student body are crucial if the student services sector is to anticipate its future and control its environment. New approaches, new programs, and new goals are urged in light of financial restrictions and changing student needs. National trends, community developments, and changes within higher education are cited as factors that will affect the student services branch. Included is a discussion of declining enrollments, rise in adult education programs, declines in employment opportunities for college graduates, loss of political support for higher education, growth of the enrollment of women, and the rise of vocationalism. Specific implications of the changes within higher education are presented and their potential results are discussed. (Author/SF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175327

The Future of Student Services: Parameters, Resources, and Consumer Interests

by

Frederick R. Brodzinski
Coordinator of Student Activities
Teachers College
Columbia University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frederick R. Brodzinski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

An Address Prepared For and Delivered at the First National Conference on Student Services

Madsion, Wisconsin
October 29, 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 011 629

The major purpose of my remarks this morning is to identify several developments which will probably have significant influences on the future of higher education in general and on the student services sector in particular. In identifying those developments I hope to focus your attention on those forces which, I believe, will have some impact on your particular areas of concern. A secondary purpose of my comments is to bring to your attention the importance of forecasting and long range planning for the effectiveness of student services during the next decade.

Before I continue, I would like to indicate two premises which underlie my comments. The first premise is that the student services sector cannot be separated from the total higher education enterprise. Those developments which will affect higher education will also affect student services. Those of us involved in the administration, development, and implementation of such services must be keenly aware of that fact. It is indeed a simple conclusion. One that is perhaps so obvious that you wonder why I chose even to state it. Well, I suggest to you that all too often the integral nature of the various segments of our colleges and universities is ignored. Moreover, I suggest to you that during the remainder of the 70's and even more so in the 80's, the old concepts of students, faculty and administration as adversaries, as independent, separate entities will no longer be viable. We are all

dependent on each other and whether we like to admit it or not, our futures and the future of higher education itself are intertwined and interrelated. The recognition of this interdependence will become more and more important if we are to avoid serious conflicts in the future as resources become limited and the competition for those scarce resources becomes more fierce.

The second premise is that the future does not just happen. It is created and developed in the present and near past. A majority of future happenings are all somewhat rooted in the present, and in most cases, are determined by actions which have already occurred (Cornish, 1977). Consequently, I believe, that no one needs a crystal ball or a resident prophet to reasonably project future happenings. The parameters of the short term future are essentially predictable. The problem and one which is particularly applicable to student services, is that we do not take the time to use the known data and methods of forecasting to project our future environments (Fowles, 1978). Perhaps even more disheartening is the fact that quite often when distinct trends or developments are discovered, there is little or no attention given to them and they are quickly ignored. Too often in the last few years we have chosen to disregard unfavorable projections and trends and too quickly have we embraced those forecasts which promised a continuation of the unique and unusual bountifulness of the sixties and early seventies. This situation is no longer tolerable for higher education in general and indeed for student services in particular. For if present trends continue, and if certain developments become general

practice, student services, as we know it, will be in very serious difficulty in the next ten years.

Accepting my premises for the moment, the next question quite logically is what can we dc about this potential if not present problem. There are some obvious answers; Be more creative; Be more dynamic; Exert better management and other easily suggested solutions. My contention, however, is that we all must become, in a sense, Futurists. That we all must become sensitive to developments which are occurring around us. That we all must learn those determiners of the future which cannot be changed and those which can somehow be altered. The student services sector has been primarily a reactive group. I suggest, that it must become proactive if it is to survive the next ten years as an effective and integral part of the higher education community. It must learn to anticipate and control its environment. If it doesn't, I suggest, that it will become extinct. Not in the sense that it will disappear totally, but in the sense that the form and substance of student services will be so altered that they will be hardly recognizable as having any relationship to those which we have known in the past. For just as other elements within higher education and society at large have disappeared when they lost their effectiveness or were rendered unnecessary by technological innovations or changes in the needs of society, so will student services disappear as a functional element within higher education if we do not carefully plan and anticipate

our future course.

I submit to you that change and the ever increasing pace of change will be especially cruel to a group which is supposed to be sensitive to developments within the student population. How often in the past have we in student services fallen from grace because we did not anticipate changes in student needs and concerns? More importantly, how long in the future will we be able to continue if we do not anitcipate, plan and prepare for such changes? Not long, I assure you! Already, many of the traditional student service functions are being usurped by other offices, machines, regulatory bodies, and off-campus entrepreneurs which can perform those functions more efficiently and effectively because they are future oriented by design or financial incentive and have no vested interest in continuing past programs, procedures and structures. We in student services must learn to adapt, to be future oriented. We must become credible predictors of student needs and interests if we expect to remain a viable element on our own campuses. Allow me to substantiate my assertion that student services have suffered a decline. I suggest three items for your consideration. First, I suggest you review the pages of the On Campus Report for the past year. The reports of financial difficulties dot the pages. Second, I call your attention to the 1976 budget status survey conducted by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

(Nelson, Heller, and Peterson, 1976). The results of that survey indicate that two-thirds of the responding institutions experienced financial retrenchment in their student services bare budget. Third, I urge you to look at some of the recent dissertations regarding student governments (Bender, 1976) or the studies of student participation in organized activities (Wise, 1978). The percentages of student bodies participating in elections and organized activities is appalling.

To avoid being labeled a harbinger of doom, allow me to suggest how being future oriented can improve student services, what developments will affect those services, and what we can anticipate in terms of parameters, resources, and consumer interests.

I firmly believe that we need to develop new approaches, new programs and new goals for student services based on the realities of the future and not on our past concepts. I suggest that by anticipating the changes, trends and developments which will affect higher education and the student population we can reconceptualize our approach to student services. For I believe that we cannot merely alter our techniques and expect to be credible and viable in say the year 1985. We must recognize that the need for many of the services that we traditionally provided has been irrevocably changed or nullified by circumstances totally beyond our control and that our techniques for providing such services have in many instances, been rendered obsolete by technological and managerial developments. The key to future

success, I submit, is to incorporate those technological and managerial developments into our own operations. We must learn to use the tools available to establish new roles for ourselves within the institutional structure. One of those tools is future planning.

Even a cursory examination of institutions of higher education will reveal that compared with other sectors of the institution, student services probably has done the least to prepare for and project its future. Other sectors have planning committees, departments of institutional research, curriculum revision committees and other such bodies which directly or indirectly plan for the future. But what have we in student services done to insure our future? Most of us don't have formal structures or bodies which regularly and systemically project our futures. Perhaps more important than not having such bodies is the fact that many of us don't see any reason for their existence. It seems all too often we are overwhelmed by the problems of the current semester that we hardly have time to plan for the next semester, let alone consider our situations two or three years hence.

In the last two decades, student services had no compelling need to be future oriented. In the period of expansion since World War II our major decisions typically involved which new programs to establish, which staff to hire, which office to expand and how to spend the increases in our budgets to meet the ever increasing demands of a large and larger student

body. Planning was not foremost in our minds as our mistakes were easily obliterated in a continual flow of students and funds. However, we are now in that often-talked about, yet infrequently seriously considered no growth period. The term no growth is not overtly threatening. However, allow me to use the translation supplied by Edward B. Fiske, Education Editor of the New York Times. He said that we should think of the period we are now in, not as a period of no growth, but as a period of contraction. For as he very simply and effectively pointed out, the two essentials for growth are no longer in ready supply: money and students (Fiske, 1977). If we in student services begin to consider the ramifications of shortages in these two essential areas, we will very quickly realize the need to study, analyze and project our future roles in higher education. For if enrollment decreases and funds diminish, who will be the first to suffer? Will it be the tenured or unionized faculty? Will it be the upper level fiscal or academic administrators? Or will it be the student services sector which, by definition, is involved in many activities which are not absolutely necessary to the functioning of the institution? What we ourselves often refer to as extra-curricular activities. It is not a great revelation to point out that when "things get tight," the first items to go are the "extras"!

Obviously, I am somewhat concerned about the future of student services. However, I am also confident that if we can all adopt a futurist perspective

that we can insure, that the significant contributions to higher education and student development which have come from the student services sector will continue through this period of contraction. When I say that we should adopt a futurist perspective or become futurists, I am not saying that we all need to become professional forecasters or certified projectors of the future. What I mean is that we all need to begin to examine survey results, trends, and developments not just in regard to our present situations, but in regard to their implications for our future. We need to routinely consider the future significance of the information which is readily available to us through professional publications and the common media. We need to not just acknowledge that such and such will have an effect on our area but to begin to anticipate the possible courses of action that will be required of us and to plan and develop our activities accordingly. I am confident that everyone in this room could list for me five recent developments or trends which will have an impact on student services. Yet I am also just as confident that very few of you would be able to tell me what the functional impact of those trends would be on your campus or moreover, how you have prepared to deal with those possible situations. Therefore, I believe it beneficial at this time to review some of the developments which will have an impact on student services.

It seems to me that there are three areas in which developments could have an impact on student services. I suggest that we should be sensitive

to changes in these areas and incorporate such changes in our future planning. Those three areas are:

(1.) National Patterns
(2.) The Community Outside of Higher Education
(3.) The Community Within Higher Education.

Changes in National Patterns received the most attention and general publicity. Data in this area are most readily available from government agencies, such as the Census Bureau, the National Center for Educational Statistics, and the Bureau of Labor. I call your attention to the following developments.

First, the Decline in the National Birthrate according to the National Center for Health Statistics the general fertility rate (that is, the live births per 1,000 women 15 to 44 years old) has continually declined from a high of 130 per 1000 in 1956 to approximately 65 per 1000 in 1976. The actual number of 5 olds dropped 15 % between 1960 and 1970. Those five year olds are the prime college youth of 1978 and beyond. Based on these facts, it is projected that in 1979, 18 year olds will total about 4.3 million. After 1979 they will decrease in number so that by 1990 there will be less than 3.5. million 18 year olds. A clear and simple decrease of over 800,000 potential college students. It is also interesting to note that the country has had almost zero population growth since 1972.

Quite simply, these statistics indicate that there will soon be fewer people in the prime college age bracket of 18 to 21 years of age. As most projections for enrollment are based on some percentage of that group going to college, we can easily project a decline in enrollment based on national

birthrates. The projections of decline vary. Earlier projections showed a decrease in the 1980's and an increase after 1995. However, recent statistics indicate the leveling may have already occurred, with a decline immediately impending. In 1975, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching revised the estimate of 1984 enrollments done by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education only four years earlier, downward by 1.5 million students. The American College Testing Program estimates that there could be 24% fewer students enrolling as early as 1980. Professor George Wethersby of Harvard, citing the fact that live births peaked in the 1960-62 period, forecasts that the absolute number of 18 year olds will peak in 1980 and decline by 20% in 1985 (Wethersby, 1977).

Although there are some variations in the enrollment projections based on the national birthrate, they all indicate an impending period of decline. The real questions are how soon and how severe a decline. Considering the fact that higher education, as I interpret the statistics, experienced an actual enrollment decline in 1976 (Parker 1977), I suggest the decline has begun and will be more severe than the commonly accepted projections indicate. Stephen Dresch of Yale University who has been shockingly accurate in his predictions using a combination demographic-economic model predicts a 40 percent decline in enrollments between 1980 and 1990 (Dresch, 1975).

Allow me to add two related trends for those of you who have blind faith in the restoration of the 18 to 21 year old potential student pool.

According to the Census Bureau, the Marriage rate declined in 1974, 1975, and 1976. Moreover the rate for 1976 was the lowest since 1967. Intensifying this trend is the fact that the divorce rate increased in 1975 by 4%. The tenth annual increase in that rate.

Quite simply all of these figures conjure up a future where there will be less students in the 18 to 21 year old pool of potential college goers. Lyman A. Glenny, Director of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley, estimates that based on live births, that by 1990 we will have the same number of college age youth we had in 1965-66 (Glenny, 1973). Wethersby similarly suggests that the pool of college age youth will return to 1967 levels during the 1980's. Although these trends and projections indicate some difficulties for higher education in the future, they would not be so dramatic if it wasn't for the second development in national trends, which is a Change in the Pattern of College Attendance.

Most major projections of enrollment for higher education take the number of 18 year olds in our population and then multiply that number by the percentage of high school graduates going on to college and mechanically produce an enrollment projection. Well, we have already seen that the first figure in this formula is declining. The final figure could be maintained if we increased the percentage of college attendance. Well, I'm afraid the trend is in the opposite direction. In 1968 about 55% of high school graduates attended college. Recently, however, that percentage has dropped to 48%. Roger Rapoport, writing in Esquire Magazine, estimates

will student services be prepared to provide appropriate services to this important and growing segment of our population.

These three changes in our national patterns do not hold much promise for higher education. The declining birthrate indicates a smaller pool of people in the prime college age bracket of 18 to 21. The decline in college attendance and high school completion indicates that less of that reduced pool will be going on to college, and the rise in median age suggests that this situation will not be a temporary or short lived phenomenon.

The second major area where, I believe, developments will have an impact on student services and higher education is the Community Outside of Higher Education. I call your attention to the following developments in that area.

First, the Ending of the G.I. Bill. Last year the ending of entitlement to G.I. Bill benefits occurred for a considerable number of veterans. This resulted in a 33% drop in veteran enrollment. The number of veterans losing their entitlements will continue to increase until 1981. By 1987, the G.I. Bill, as we now know it, will no longer exist.

Second, the Decline in Employment Opportunities for College Graduates. The number and proportion of college graduates in our society exceeds the number and proportion of professional and managerial positions, and there is presently no hope for expansion of those jobs. Both the market advantage of a college degree and the financial rate of return on investing in a college degree will decline (Freeman, 1976, Freeman & Hollomon, 1975). In 1976, 1.3 million people had college degrees. This is double that of 1966. Yet the

number of professional, managerial, technical, and administrative jobs grew only about 33% in the same period. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts the supply of college graduates to exceed the demand throughout the mid- 1980's (U.S.Department of Labor, 1978) and that by 1985 there may be as many as 2.5 college graduates competing for every available job, an over supply of about 12,500 graduates per year between now and 1980 and about 140,000 per year between 1980 and 1985 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1974; Trivett, 1975; Carey, 1976). Fred Best and Barry Stern, writing in the Monthly Labor Review estimate that by 1985 the oversupply of college graduates will be at a minimum of about 1.6 million (Best and Stern, 1977).

A third development in this area is the Rise of Consumerism and Its Extension to Students. Since 1970, more and more students have assumed the burden for their college expenses (Wise, 1976). This direct financial interest, coupled with a national rise in consumerism, will likely yield a shift in student values. They will see themselves as clients of their colleges and will demand to be treated with the rights and respect this role entails (Peltason and Massengale, 1978). Legal actions and involvement of the federal government in this area seem to signal continued growth in the movement for student consumer rights. Furthermore, changes in the nature and composition of student bodies, suggest that students are and will be demanding better quality services.

Another development in this area is the General Loss of Political Support for Higher Education. Changes in social priorities, taxpayers revolts, and shifts of political support to other forms of post-secondary education, particularly vocationally oriented programs seem to indicate that

higher education has lost a great deal of its previous political support (Millett, 1977). Although it is too early to determine the full impact of Proposition #13 type legislation, the early indications are not good. It is obvious, however, that issues such as health care, the common schools, the environment, energy and recreation have surfaced as high priority social concerns. Moreover, the decline in the proportion of the Gross National Product used for higher education is, in my opinion, a significant development which will have long term consequences (Carnegie Foundation, 1975).

A fifth development in the Community Outside of Higher Education is the Decline in the Relationship of Business and Higher Education. Where once business went to higher education for employee training, it is now organizing its own programs and actually establishing schools with all the trappings of college campuses. Some of these company schools have already been accredited to award the bachelor's degree and master's degree, while others offer programs recognized for college credit (Glenny, 1973). Last year more than 550 formal courses recognized for college credit were sponsored by such organizations as Lockheed, General Electric and Xerox (Program on Non-Collegiate Sponsored Instruction of the Office on Education Credit, 1978). These courses enrolled over 150,000 students.

A development which may have a more direct effect on student services is the Growth of Educational Benefits in Collective Bargaining Agreements. The inclusion of educational benefits has become one of the most significant bargaining trends in the 1970's. Some six million workers are now covered by negotiated tuition aids, educational leaves, and apprenticeship training programs (Abbott, 1976). Are your student services able to serve this

constituency?

The Increased Use of Audiovisual Media is a development that student service personnel should recognize and use to their advantage. People in our society, and particularly today's young people, rely increasingly on television, cassettes, and film at the expense of written media (Wagschal, 1978). Student services offices would do well to consider the effects of this orientation.

Changes in our national patterns and the community outside of education will have an indirect effect on student services, however, changes within higher education itself will have a direct impact on the content, organization, and delivery of such services. I suggest you consider the following developments in the Community Within Higher Education.

First is the growth of nontraditional institutions and programs. Colleges without walls, satellite campuses, weekend colleges and other non-traditional forms of higher education are attracting increasing numbers of adult students. To the extent that we can expect more adult students on our own campuses and keeping in mind that we, in traditional schools, will have to compete with non-traditional institutions for students, it would be to our advantage to learn what makes these non-traditional programs so attractive and the types of student services they provide.

A second development in this area is the Growth of Enrollment of Women Students. Women have increased their proportion in the undergraduate enrollment in the last five years and now comprise at least half of all first and second year students. In that same period, according to the Census Bureau,

the number of women ages 25 to 34 attending college has more than doubled and the number under 25 rose 30% (U.S. Census Bureau, 1977). Student services must be prepared to serve and retain this very important segment of our student bodies.

A related development is the Growing Importance of Adult Students. In 1975, 34% of total college enrollments, or 3.7 million students, were adults over the age of 25 (Graulich, 1977). This is a substantial increase over the 22% or 1.7 million enrollment in 1970. Since adult education appears to be the only growth market for higher education, student services had better learn how to serve this new constituency. Particularly since the Census Bureau now indicates that 48% of all students enrolled in higher education are age 22 or older. Moreover, a recent study by the College Board indicated that more than 40 million Americans or 36% of the working population between the ages of 16 and 65- are in some stage of career or job transition and more than half of this group plans to return to some type of education for advancement (Arbeiter, et al., 1978).

A fourth and final major development within higher education is the Rise of Vocationalism. A sagging economy and a tight job market have made students more vocationally oriented (Spekke, 1976). The rate of return on the investment in a college education has dropped about 4% (Freeman & Hollomon, 1975). Consequently, students are aware of these conditions and are selecting courses of study and activities more directly related to an identifiable career path. Any quick comparison of the applications for professional schools with those for more general graduate study will quickly demonstrate this trend.

What I have attempted to do to this point is to identify certain developments which, I believe, indirectly indicate what will be the parameters, resources, and consumers interests student services will encounter in the years ahead. Allow me to summarize those developments in a most simplistic fashion.

Our enrollments will decline. Not only will there be less potential students as the number of 18 to 21 year olds declines, but there will be a smaller percentage of that diminished group which will decide to attend college. High school students will be motivated to choose other forms of post-secondary education by a lack of jobs for college graduates (Froomkin, 1974) and a decreasing return on the investment required to attend college. This situation is intensified by the demise of the G.I. Bill and further complicated by the loss of political and business support, and the emergence of strong competitors for the already scarce resource of students in the form of the corporate college and the non-traditional institution.

New students are not only on campus but will probably be the dominent force in the next decade. They will be older, female and view the college student relationship from the perspective of a consumer. Their orientation will be vocational and their interests career related.

These trends and projections are indeed interesting but what are their implications for the future of student services? I believe, that they will produce four changes in the student services sector. These are:

1. A Reduction of Resources
2. An Increase in Internal Accountability

3. A Focus on Individual Goals

4. A Revival of the Student Personnel Point Of View

A Reduction of Resources will occur as a result of a decline in enrollments and external funding. Not only will budgets contract but the resources within those budgets will be less effective as a result of inflation and general increases in the cost of operation relative to socially mandated expenditures (social security taxes, affirmative action, provision for the handicapped, personnel requirements and other legislation (Bowen, 1978). Moreover, there will be fierce competition between the various departments and offices within the institution for what scarce financial resources will be available.

An Increase in Internal Accountability will develop from the change in the relationship of the student to the institution. Students will be a more demanding clientele. The effects of the rise in consumerism will be reflected in this area. Students will want to be convinced that they are getting their money's worth and that activities fees and other allocations are being used effectively. In a buyer's market populated largely by adult students, student services will be called upon more frequently to justify their programs and expenditures. Moreover, faculty and other sectors of the institution will not hesitate to question expenditures for anything they deem not to be essential to the operation of the institution.

A personal orientation among students will force student services to Focus on Individual Goals. Increased concern over employment after graduation, the decline in the value of the college degree, and the rise in vocationalism support the creation of this situation. Several researchers have

already documented a rise in privatism (Leemon, 1977). This tendency for students to focus on their individual goals and to have less of a commitment to the institution and less concern for their fellow students will have a significant impact on the academic as well as the student services sector. This situation is further reinforced by the increasing diversity in our student bodies. Students in the future will come from a wider variety of backgrounds, and ages; and will bring to the campus very specific interests, needs, and expectations. They will not be satisfied in knowing that a certain program has this as that general purpose. They will want to know what that program will do for them, how it will help them meet their goals. This situation will create some professional and organizational problems for student services administrators.

Finally, I believe the changes in institutional finances, the composition of Student bodies, and the vocational orientation of students will result in a revival of the student personnel point of view (Williamson, 1949). I see this revival coming about as student services are asked to concentrate on three objectives: the enhancement of the competitive position of the institution, the general retention of enrolled students, and the implementation of student activities.

In the coming severe competition for students, student services will be a competitive factor. The quality, quantity, and availability of such services will be marketed as an attraction of an institution. College recruiters will seek facets of their institution which can be shown to be better or more effective than their competitors and student services offer that

possibility. This situation has already occurred in numerous non-traditional forms of higher education and in regard to career planning and placement services in traditional institutions.

During the next decade, one will be very hard put to find extra students to replace those that drop out or transfer. It is indeed less costly to retain students than to recruit them and the importance of these facts will not be lost to the faculty and administration. Consequently, I believe student services will be asked to focus on the retention of students and held accountable for maintaining high retention and low attrition rates. In this regard the maintenance of an attractive and desireable campus life will play a significant role and will be a primary goal of student services.

One of the results of the recent developments within higher education and a rather disturbing trend is the abdication by students of the responsibility for organized student activities. In recent years the attention given by student governments to the development of social activities and student clubs and groups has declined. The shift of this attention from these traditional functions has left a void only professional staff can fill. it seems to me that professional staffs will once again be called upon to develop, implement, and actively support student activities and organizations. More and more during the next decade student activities will be placed in the hands of professional staff by students whose interests and concerns lie elsewhere. A pattern of active intervention will be required of professional staff. This will indeed be a demanding and challenging task

as there will probably be less staff and less resources to direct to this purpose.

Having now outlined the major developments which I believe will influence student services and suggested several effects of those trends, I would like to discuss the practical application of those forecasts to the administration of current operations and the development of future programs. I believe that knowledge of these trends and forecasts can best be applied to student services if we consider three things in planning our programs: the parameters of the student bodies on our individual campuses, the institutional resources we can expect, and the consumer interests we will have to satisfy.

In the mathematical sense, I believe that the general functions of the student services will not substantially change but that the specific forms of those services will be influenced by the introduction of new variables in our student bodies. Ask yourself, <u>how have your parameters changed?</u> Do you have more adult students? What percentage of your student body is part time? How many women are enrolled at your institution? As you examine the answers to these questions, I believe, you will begin to see that the parameters of your student bodies have indeed changed from the traditional 18 to 21 year old full time male student. If so, and perhaps more importantly, are your programs and services oriented to those new parameters or are they still in a form appropriate to the needs and interests of post-high school student and his full time schedule and avail-

ability. I suggest that in order to be effective, you will need to give serious consideration to the appropriate time, place, and manner by which you deliver services to your students.

The amount of institutional resources that can be devoted to student service is an important aspect to consider in planning programs. I am not speaking here of the immediate budget but the resources that can be expected in the future. Being aware of the coming contraction in budgets, you should attempt to develop programs which will be self-supporting or require a minimal amount of institutional funding. Programs which will utilize existing human and physical resources are those which will have the greatest potential for success and continuance. Programs based on increased allocations or even present allocations will face difficult obstacles to their survival. An effort should be made to identify methods by which economies can be made in existing programs. Moreover, those programs which are cost-effective should be studied and analyzed in view of their application to other areas.

If Doctors Wethersby and Glenny are correct, we can expect the proportion of institutional resources allocated to student services during the 1980's to be about 1966-1967 levels. It may be productive for all of us to go back and examine the budgets and resources which were available to student services during those years and to plan our future programs accordingly. Based on the current enrollment projections, I believe it reasonable to suggest that student services will probably receive about a 20% decrease in resources during the 1980's from 1976 levels. This

situation will, of course, vary from campus to campus but as a general guideline is, it seems to me, a reasonable expectation.

In light of such a decrease, it is important that student services begin now to plan and implement programs which are self-supporting, require no institutional funding or can be shown to have a high degree of cost-effectiveness. The coming decade will require that student services professionals and student leaders be more frugal, cost-conscious, and efficient. Greater investments of human capital in terms of energy, creativity, and cooperation will also be required. Many student services and administrators have already been asked to do more with less, however, I fear that in the next decade many more of us will be asked to do a great deal with almost nothing.

Finally, I suggest that consumer interests should be a consideration in planning student services. Although many tend to reject the notion of a student as an educational consumer, it is indeed an idea whose time has come (Federal Interagency Committee on Education, 1977). Moreover, it is a helpful guideline to use in the sense of planning programs which will meet the needs and interests of the student body which is growing more diverse and more interested in how its tuition and fees are being spent (El-Khawas, 1977).

Many of the present interests of educational consumers will, in my opinion, continue. Interests in such services as counseling, placement, financial aid, social and educational programs will continue. However, due to the changing nature of our student bodies and society, I believe we can

expect certain new interests to develop and other interests to rise on the list of priorities. Services in the area of occupational preparation: internships, cooperative education, resume writing, and interview skills will become more important as the competition for jobs increases. Services in the area of academic competence: tutoring, speedreading, study skills, and term paper writing will receive greater interest as students from more diverse backgrounds enter our institutions. Services for adult and women students such as child care, night and weekend office hours and programs geared to part-time student involvement will increase in popularity as greater segments of our student population are composed of female students and students over 25 years of age. Services which offer financial savings such as: book exchanges, discount ticket services, job listings, housing listings, legal services, and inexpensive recreational opportunities will also receive higher priority as the consumer index continues its upward spiral. The area of student consumerism is indeed an area which is in the developmental stage (Stark, 1976). Presently, it has been reflected in demands for more accurate and detailed information (Green, 1978). Its full impact is yet to be determined. However, I suggest to you that it is an area that merits your attention and consideration.

In summary, it appears that there are some distinct and well documented trends that will have a significant effect on the future of student services. I have suggested some of the changes we can expect and their implications for planning future programs. The future is now in your hands.

Confucius says that " He who makes predictions and has no power to bring them into being will end his days eating abandoned birds' nests". No doubt, the day will come when my diet will include poached vacated avain habitats. But, if you as student leaders and student services professionals adopt a futurist perspective and requlary plan and evaluate your futures, you will not only have the insight to make accurate predictions, but the foresight to make sure that the worst of those predictions never come into being. That action, above all else, would be the most significant influence on the future of student services.

References

Abbott, W. "Negotiated Career education increasing among unions." Education Tomorrow. World Future Society, Washington, D.C.: August, 1976.

Arbeiter, S., Aslanian, C.B., Schmerbech, F.A., and Brickell, H.M., 40 million Americans in career transition: the need for information. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Bender, Barbara, "The Purposes and Function of Contemporary Student Government: A Descriptive Analysis." ED.D. Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1976.

Best, F., & Stern, B. "Education work, and leisure: must they come in the order?" Monthly Labor Review. July, 1977.

Bowen, H.R. "Some Reflections on the Current Position and Future Outlook of American Higher Education." N A S P A Journal. 1978, 16 (1).

Carey, M.L. "Revised occupational projections to 1985." Monthly Labor Review. November, 1976.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New students and new places. Policies for the future growth and development of American higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, October, 1971.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. More than survival. Prospects for higher education in a period of uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Cornish, Edward. The study of the future. Washington, D.C.: World Future Society, 1977.

Dresch, S.P. "Educational saturation: a demographic-economic model." A A U P Bulletin. Autumn, 1975.

El-Khawas, E.H. Better information for student choice; Report of a National Task Force. Report presented at the National Conference on Better Information for student Choice, Washington, D.C., 1977

Federal Interagency Committee on Education. Toward a federal strategy for Protection of the Consumer of education. Washington, D.C.: United States Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, 1977.

Fields, G. "Middle class youth increasingly choose work and not college." The Wall Street Journal, July 20, 1978, p.1.

Fiske, E.B. "University Systems in a No-Growth Period." New York Times, March 13, 1977. section IV, page 8.

Fowles, J. (Ed.) Handbook of Futures Research. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1978.

Frankel, M.M. & Harrison, F.W. Projections of education statistics to 1985-86. National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Freeman, R.B. The over-educated American. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Freeman, R. & Hollomon, J.H. "The declining value of college going." Change. September, 1975.

Froomkin, J. Changing credential objectives of students in post-secondary education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Contract #0574257, 1974.

Glenny, L. "Pressures on higher education." College & University Journal. September, 1973, 12 (4).

Graulich, D.J. "Adult students alter face of U.S. Colleges as enrollments falter." The Wall Street Journal, January 24, 1977, p.1.

Green, S. "Students as Consumers: The Need for Better Information." Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association. Spring, 1978, 4-8.

Leemon, T.A. "The Student Cultures: The Challenge of Privatism." Paper presented at the 1977 Convention of the American College Personnel Association.

Longanecker,D.,Cahdima,S., Wabnick,R., and Wilson,L. Federal assistance for postsecondary education: options for fiscal year 1979. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Maeroff, G.I."Schools feel impact of graying population". New York Times. January 8, 1978, section13,p.1.

Millett, J.D. "Higher education cost realities" Stability and Change-Postsecondary Education's Future. Atlanta, Georgia:Southern Regional Education Board,1977.

Nelson, G.M., Heller,L.A., Peterson,P. "NASPA Budget Status Survey." NASPA Field Report. Fall, 1976,1(3).

Parker,G. Collegiate enrollments in the U.S., 1976-77: statistics, interpretation, and trends in four-year and related institutions. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1977.

Peltason, J.W. & Massengale, M.V. (Eds.) Students and their institutions: a changing relationship. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1978.

Program on Non-Collegiate Sponsored Instruction of the Office on Educational Credit. The national guide to credit recommendations for non-collegiate courses. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.: 1978.

Rapoport, R. "New myth on campus." Esquire, September, 1974.

Reinhold,R. "Wide changes in economy and way of life expected as median age of Americans rise." New York Times, February 6, 1977.

Spekke,A. "Is going to college worth the investment?" The Futurist. December, 1976.

Stark,J.S. (Ed.) Promoting consumer protection for students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Trivett,D.A. "Jobs and college graduates." ERIC Research Currents. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Projections of the population of the United States, 1977 to 2050. Series P-25, No. 704. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. "School enrollment-social and economic characteristics of students: October 1976," (Advance Report). Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 309. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statiatics. Occupational Manpower and Training Needs. Bulletin 1824, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office 1974.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistic. Occupational Outlooks for College Graduates 1978-79 Edition Bulletin No. 1956. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.Occupational outlook for College graduates 1974-75 Edition. Bulletin 1786. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Wagschal, P.H. "Illiterates with doctorates: the future of education in an electronic age". The Futurist. August, 1978.

Wethersby, G. "The coming enrollment crisis: strategies for the future". Paper presented at the annual Conference of the Eastern Association of College Deans and Advisers of Students. Philadelphia, December, 1977.

Williamson, E.G. The Student Personnel Point of View. American Council on Education, Seroes VI. Student Personnel Words, No. 13, Washington, D.C., 1949

Wise, W.M. "Major Developments to influence college students in the late '70's".NASPA Journal,Fall, 1976, 14 (2).

Wise, W.M. "Conversations about organized student activities in colleges". NASPA Journal, Winter,1978, 15 (3).